

**MCI / BELL SOUTH  
ACTION REGISTRY CALL  
MEETING MINUTES  
Nov. 1, 2001**

**29.) Winback process (10/23)**

Questions sent to BST on 10/23. Shannon W. is working this issue.

1. How long after a customer migrates to MCI does BellSouth wait before attempting any win back process?
2. From what point in the migration of a customer to MCI does BellSouth consider the clock started on the waiting period before BellSouth would attempt a win back?
3. If an MCI customer calls BellSouth customer service (assuming for some reason other than to migrate back to BellSouth) before the win back process can begin does BellSouth use the at call as a win back opportunity?
4. Are BellSouth customer service reps specifically trained to direct that customer to MCI and not to use that call as a win back opportunity?

Next Steps:

Pending response from BST

**30.) Incorrect Company Name in Billing Section of CSR (9/6)  
Escalated to Sharon Daniels 10/19**

Joe's emails closing 1<sup>st</sup> example of incorrect company in the billing section.

"This is in response to your e-mail dated September 6, 2001, requesting why the billing name for account 404-209-7836 appeared to be Supra Telecom instead of MCI. Following are the results of BellSouth's investigation: Upon review of BellSouth's records, order N09KBGY6 was issued with an incorrect billing name for Supra Telecom even though the Billing Telephone Number (BTN) and Operating Company Number (OCN) were correct for MCI. As a result, the account billed correctly, but showed the incorrect billing name. The billing records have been corrected."

Joe's 10/11 email

"There is no further analysis that can be conducted. This was an isolated incident which was corrected once MCI contacted the LCSC. I believe a more prudent use of resources would be to try to correct a pattern of such errors. If you can provide to me more examples that involved this type of error we can work to correct it. But there is not anymore to say about 404-209-7836."

This response did not answer MCI's questions about the cause or fix of the problem. MCI provided a second example to BST on 10/11.

BST stated that the ERT for this issue is completed.

Next Steps:

BST sent the ERT on 11/2. Pending MCI review.

**31.) Account Team Information Package requested on 10/15 (10/31)**

In Florida Observation 115 cites the "Account Tem Information Package" as having documented customer contact timeframes. The SLA the observation specifically mentions is a 24 hour response to emails and voice mails. Do you have a copy of this document? I would be interested in understanding all the SLAs it outlines for the BST account team.

Pamela was not aware of this document outlining Account Team SLAs. BST will continue to research.

Next Steps:

Pending response from BST.

**32.) Invalid Reject BCS (10/31)**

**MCI / BELL SOUTH  
ACTION REGISTRY CALL  
MEETING MINUTES  
Nov. 1, 2001**

MCI has been receiving rejects of "Pls add BCS and Line Class of Service" from BST and need some additional clarification regarding the rules surrounding LNECLS SVC and BCS. If this is something that's required, we need to know where it is stating that in their documentation.

Their BBRLO states that:

Line Class of service is optional but is required when the BCS is populated, but BCS is only required when the REQTYP is "E".

BCS is only used for Resale, therefore we do not have this field for Platform. So we're a bit perplexed as to why this reject message is being returned and exactly what they are expecting. Rita Andes

Kathy R. researched the 6 examples sent by MCI. MCI is correct that BCS and Line Class of Service is not required and this appears to be a rep error.

Of the 6 examples 3 were from the same rep. BST is pushing for rep cover but requested the additional examples.

Kathy stated that the 6 orders fell out for valid error or other reason. BST will get correct clarifications to MCI.

Next Steps:

**Matt sent the list of 70 TNs to BST on 11/2/01  
Pending BST resolution**

BST and MCI agreed to not hold this call on Thanksgiving day.

# **ATTACHMENT 8**

**MCI / BELL SOUTH  
ACTION REGISTRY CALL  
MEETING MINUTES  
Nov. 1, 2001**

---

Bridge Information: Vnet: 211-8589 Toll Free: 888-324-5904 Pass Code: 6902  
Time: 3:00 PM EST every Thursday

---

Meeting Attendees	Company
Rick Whisamore	MCI
Caren Schaffner	MCI
Amanda Hill	MCI
John Estep	MCI
Regina Fraiser	MCI
Pam Shifflet	MCI
Rita Andes	MCI
Sandy Tonges	MCI
Doug Lacy	MCI
Matt Walker	MCI
Steve Ramsbacher	MCI
Pat Woods	MCI
Pam Shifflet	MCI
Nancy Shimer	MCI
Steve Harris	BST
Calvin Jung	BST
Pamela Reynolds	BST
Shannon Waters	BST
Meradith Little	BST
Kathy Ragsdale	BST

**1.) No Dial Tone (6/18)**

ERT continues in the review process. No ETA.

Sherry asked were BST was on the single "C" order process. Pamela did not have a status but said she would check with Gary from the Flow Through Task Force.  
PL don't know FTTF working on it.

**Next Steps:**

Pending ERT. No ETA.

Pamela to get status of the "C" order process

**2.) Annual Handling (U&A?)**

CLOSING/16

**3.) Completing orders in the billing system (6/13)**

The BST Account Team had previously told MCI that no report was available to BST or MCI that would list TNs in the Hold File or pending billing status. MCI was informed by David Scollard during a 10/10 face to face in FL that a report does exist and MCI could get that from the Account Team.

Rick stated that during the 10/4 call Kathy cited 14 TNs that fell out for (Working Service ADL)

**MCI / BELL SOUTH  
ACTION REGISTRY CALL  
MEETING MINUTES  
Nov. 1, 2001**

Kathy stated BST receives many (202 in one day) rejects for this reason. She stated in order for MCI to fix the problem the Working Service On Promise (WSOP) should be populated by MCI. Also, ADL should be floated behind class of service on the activity page.

Loraine from MCI has reviewed the BellSouth business rules and finds them to be inconsistent with Kathy Ragsdale's statement on October 4th about the use of the WSOP FID. MCI is also unable to clearly determine from the business rules when MCI should use the ADL FID.

MCI requested clarification on this issue via a conference call with BellSouth's SMEs at the soonest possible date. During that call MCI would like to clarify how BellSouth expects MCI to fill out the LSR for this type of order to allow complete flow through and where that is documented in the BellSouth business rules.

Pamela has the action item to arrange that call.

MCI was dissatisfied with all answers provided by BSO on the 10/18 ERT. MCI is considering next steps.

**Next steps-**

Pamela to arrange conf. call to address WSOP issue  
MCI continues to review BSO's ERT

- 12.) Class of Svc LNPRL      CLOSED 7/26
- 13.) CARE- Incorrect PICs      CLOSED 10/4
- 15.) Inside Wire      CLOSED 10/4
- 16.) PMAP error message      CLOSED 10/17
- 17.) **Asterisk in address field of a CSR (8/8)**

Steve H. is working this issue. The ERT is still pending with no ETA. In his research he found that orders sent without asterisk's where they should be only flow through in former Southern Bell states (GA FL SC & NC).

**Next Steps-**

Pending ERT. No ETA.

**18.) RSAG (8/1)**

MCI stated that it has been eight weeks since BST said they covered their reps and MCI has seen no decrease in the number of occurrences (70 this week)

Steve H said he went last week to the director of the center to encourage them to resolve this training issue.

Doug L will send Pamela this weeks list of 70 to help BST identify the reps still incorrectly citing the CSR rather than RSAG.

**Next Steps-**

Acct. Team working to get reps trained  
Doug to send new examples to BST

**MCI / BELL SOUTH  
ACTION REGISTRY CALL  
MEETING MINUTES  
Nov. 1, 2001**

**19.) Line Loss Notifications (8/14)**

**Escalated to Sharon Daniels 10/19**

Sherry stated that MCI's auditing team received a faxed list of 14 TN from the BST slamming center claiming those customers were slammed. MCI researched those TNs and found that of the 14 MCI received line loss reports for 9 of them. This action directly contradicts BST's ERT claiming BST does not send line loss reports via NDM for accounts disconnected due to claims of unauthorized change of service.

Sherry further stated that MCI was never aware that any line loss reports would not come via NDM. MCI's primary objective on this issue is to get all line loss reports via NDM.

Steve asked Sherry to send him a copy of the fax from the BST slamming center. Steve also stated that BST is taking action to get all line loss reports sent.

Sherry also asked that the account team speak to Mary Henze from BST to get a clear understanding of how BST should interact with MCI to work alleged slamming issues.

Pending ERT to answer MCI's questions from 10/18 about the last ERT. No ETA

MCI requested further details on BSO's reasons for not provided line loss reports for SE customers.

Is the policy to not send SE reports via NDM documented in BSO's business rules?

What is BST's processes for handling potential "slamming" incidents included any form of investigation with the CLEC?

Is the intentional disparity between the two sources (NDM and GUI) documented by BSO?

How would orders being manually handled cause that TN to not post to the NDM report?

Next Steps-

Pending ERT. No ETA

**20.) Florida (8/9)**

Meredith L. stated that TNs with warn dial do get 911 access

Caren S. asked if that covered the entire BST footprint

Meredith said it applied where ever BST offered Quick Service.

Pam S stated that MCI received the following reject on a test order going to Florida.

UNE COMBO NOT VALID IN FL WITH RESH 7229 PER CONTRACT

Pamela R. received the email and is working this issue.

Sherry said MCI needs an answer to this question ASAP.

MW service center fell out when they typed the order.

SL why didn't it flow through

Next Steps-

Pending response from BSO

**21.) Rejects and problems associated with pons that have aged off. CLOSED 10/04**

**MCI / BELL SOUTH  
ACTION REGISTRY CALL  
MEETING MINUTES  
Nov. 1, 2001**

23.) BST Test Environment CLOSED 9/20

24.) **Manual handling/ Retail call waiting and voice mail. (9/6)**

MCI was dissatisfied with the ERT sent by BSO. MCI is considering next steps.

Next Steps-

MCI reviewing ERT.

25.) **Faxed rejects to LD TN (9/20) Escalate**

Doug L stated that MCI has a system change request for new fax TN on the LSR  
ERT was due 10/19. No new ETA

Next Steps:

Pending ERT.

26.) Can Not Restore CLOSED 10/4

27.) **Returning incorrectly formatted DUF records.**

**Escalated to Sharon Daniels for outcollection POC 10/19**

Issue 1 - 60K records with module problems –issue is closed CLOSED 10/18

**Issue 2 - 6000 incorrect intraLata toll records -open (9/20)**

Steve R. stated that MCI should see toll records in DUF. MCI sent BST 13K to research. Andy looked at 20 examples. Joe L. was going to get help from the network dept. for research.

Shannon W is researching to make sure translation was correct.

Shannon W said BST is not clear that it is translation problem.

Shannon will provide an ETA for their research.

Sherry said MCI will begin the dispute process for these records

Sherry asked if BST wanted MCI to forward new examples of this problem? Shannon asked the BST forward them all.

Sherry asked that Andy Plummer attend the next call or get Andy and Steve on the line together to work this issue.

BSO will send an ERT to respond to MCI's question of who to speak to about developing an out collection process.

Next Steps:

Pending ERT for POC to discuss outcollection process. No ETA.

28.) Migrate by TN CLOSED 11/1

BST had a CLEC call last week to discuss this issue. That process will replace MCI's questions through the Account Team. MCI feels the documentation provided by BST on that call was not sufficient for clegs to complete coding and is pursuing actions through CCP



**MCI / BELL SOUTH  
ACTION REGISTRY CALL  
MEETING MINUTES  
Nov. 1, 2001**

**29.) Winback process (10/23)**

Questions sent to BST on 10/23. Shannon W. is working this issue.

1. How long after a customer migrates to MCI does BellSouth wait before attempting any win back process?
2. From what point in the migration of a customer to MCI does BellSouth consider the clock started on the waiting period before BellSouth would attempt a win back?
3. If an MCI customer calls BellSouth customer service (assuming for some reason other than to migrate back to BellSouth) before the win back process can begin does BellSouth use the at call as a win back opportunity?
4. Are BellSouth customer service reps specifically trained to direct that customer to MCI and not to use that call as a win back opportunity?

Next Steps:

Pending response from BST

**30.) Incorrect Company Name in Billing Section of CSR (9/6)  
Escalated to Sharon Daniels 10/19**

Joe's emails closing 1<sup>st</sup> example of incorrect company in the billing section.

"This is in response to your e-mail dated September 6, 2001, requesting why the billing name for account 404-209-7836 appeared to be Supra Telecom instead of MCI. Following are the results of BellSouth's investigation: Upon review of BellSouth's records, order N09KBGY6 was issued with an incorrect billing name for Supra Telecom even though the Billing Telephone Number (BTN) and Operating Company Number (OCN) were correct for MCI. As a result, the account billed correctly, but showed the incorrect billing name. The billing records have been corrected."

Joe's 10/11 email

"There is no further analysis that can be conducted. This was an isolated incident which was corrected once MCI contacted the LCSC. I believe a more prudent use of resources would be to try to correct a pattern of such errors. If you can provide to me more examples that involved this type of error we can work to correct it. But there is not anymore to say about 404-209-7836."

This response did not answer MCI's questions about the cause or fix of the problem. MCI provided a second example to BST on 10/11.

BST stated that the ERT for this issue is completed.

Next Steps:

BST sent the ERT on 11/2. Pending MCI review.

**31.) Account Team Information Package requested on 10/15 (10/31)**

In Florida Observation 115 cites the "Account Tem Information Package" as having documented customer contact timeframes. The SLA the observation specifically mentions is a 24 hour response to emails and voice mails. Do you have a copy of this document? I would be interested in understanding all the SLAs it outlines for the BST account team.

Pamela was not aware of this document outlining Account Team SLAs. BST will continue to research.

Next Steps:

Pending response from BST.

**32.) Invalid Reject BCS (10/31)**

**MCI / BELL SOUTH  
ACTION REGISTRY CALL  
MEETING MINUTES  
Nov. 1, 2001**

MCI has been receiving rejects of "Pls add BCS and Line Class of Service" from BST and need some additional clarification regarding the rules surrounding LNECLS SVC and BCS. If this is something that's required, we need to know where it is stating that in their documentation.

Their BBRLO states that:

Line Class of service is optional but is required when the BCS is populated, but BCS is only required when the REQTYP is "E".

BCS is only used for Resale, therefore we do not have this field for Platform. So we're a bit perplexed as to why this reject message is being returned and exactly what they are expecting. Rita Andes

Kathy R. researched the 6 examples sent by MCI. MCI is correct that BCS and Line Class of Service is not required and this appears to be a rep error.

Of the 6 examples 3 were from the same rep. BST is pushing for rep cover but requested the additional examples.

Kathy stated that the 6 orders fell out for valid error or other reason. BST will get correct clarifications to MCI.

Next Steps:

**Matt sent the list of 70 TNs to BST on 11/2/01  
Pending BST resolution**

BST and MCI agreed to not hold this call on Thanksgiving day.